

SENATOR JONES: Mr. President and members of the body, I did a lot of trapping when I was a kid and I could tell him what a killer trapper is, really. It's when you put a kind of a circle type trap in a beaver run going into the bank with fine wires and it will just shut shut and break their back when they go in the run. That's what a killer trap is and...but I would be opposed to this amendment because I think that it defeats the purpose of this because this would be the same as a harassment on the bill because anyway when you...when a person catches something in a trap it belongs to the trapper that minute. If somebody comes along and lets it out, well, he just the same as stole it or something because it's not his property then. And so I would be opposed to it for that reason. And I think that we should defeat this amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Jones. Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, honorable Speaker, friends all, I didn't mention, and I'm glad Senator Elmer reminded me, that there are also other friendly animals like dogs and cats that could get caught in these traps. And even though the judge may not rule that that's interference, as Senator Jones just points out, the fact that you release the animal, once it's caught apparently that's your property and the owner of the trap also owns the animal. I don't know how that would sort out be it a domesticated animal or be it an animal that's free roaming. However, it does raise the question of if this is already covered in statute, if, indeed, the animal is the property of the trapper, then, for that reason also, we don't need trapping in this piece of legislation because it's already covered in another area. So the trapper has rights to protect its property. This would then be a duplication of that right and would not be necessary in any case. So, for that reason also, I think that it's unnecessary and it would not keep anybody from trapping. Trappers would still be allowed to continue doing their trapping. They would not be prevented from that in any way, whether this bill passed or didn't pass. Hunters would be able to continue to hunt. This would, with or without trapping, not keep anybody from doing what they chose to do. But if we do take out trapping, it would at least allow for those circumstances where somebody who did choose to exercise their prerogative to show some compassion to an animal in distress to at least do that without fear of reprisal by the court to a jail sentence. Thank you very much.